



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,345	08/18/2006	Mi Kyoung Park	YPLE.0014	4591

38327 7590 05/21/2010

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
c/o Stites & Harbison PLLC  
1199 North Fairfax Street  
Suite 900  
Alexandria, VA 22314-1437

EXAMINER
----------

BROWN, VERNAL U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/21/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/551,345	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PARK ET AL..	
	<b>Examiner</b> VERNAL U. BROWN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,11-28,35-46 and 50-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5,7-10,29-34 and 47-49 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2612

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The application of Seocho-Gun for Contact less Type Communication Tag, Portable Tag Reader for Verifying a genuine Article, And Method for Providing Information of Whether an Article is Genuine or Not filed 8/18/06 has been examined. Claims 1-61 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 45, the limitation the portable tag reader is similar to a thin type battery does not provide a definite definition of the thickness of the RFID reader.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2612

Claims 1, 5, 11-14, 46, 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106.

Regarding claims 1, 46, Hughes teaches a contact less communication tag comprising:  
contact less communication unit which wirelessly exchanges data with a tag reader (col. 5 lines 1-7), creates a power source from a power signal received from the tag reader (col. 2 lines 15-22);

A storing unit in which the product information an encryption key related information are stored (col. 2 lines 33-47, fig. 2);

An encryption unit, which encrypts the product information to be transmitted to the tag reader based on the encryption key related information (col. 6 lines 7-34).

Regarding claim 5, Hughes teaches the encryption unit provides the product information to the tag reader after encrypting the product information using the selected encryption key (col. 2 lines 33-47);

Regarding claim 11, Hughes teaches the memory is non-volatile because the tag transmit the data stored in the tag when the powering signal is received from the reader which inherently include the storing of the data in the tag memory in the absent of the powering signal (col. 1 lines 28-37) and teaches a processing unit that reads the product information from the memory (col. 5 lines 51-64).

Regarding claims 12-14, 53, Hughes teaches a generating a one time use random number, adds the one time use random number to information to be transmitted to the tag reader, provides the number to the encryption unit, and check if a random number extracted from information received from the tag reader is the same as the one time use random number (col. 7 lines 16-31).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 56-57, Hughes teaches authenticating an external portable tag reader by communicating with the external portable tag reader; and outputting a result of authentication concerning the external portable tag reader (col. 7 lines 16-31).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106 in view of Stewart et al. US Patent 6933848.

Regarding claim 15, Hughes is silent on teaching the tag is destroyed so as not to be accessed by the tag reader when the product is unsealed. Stewart et al. in an analogous art teaches destroying the tag so as to prevent the tag from been read by the tag reader (col. 3 lines 23-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hughes et al. as disclosed by Stewart et al. destroying the tag increases the security of the RFID tag by preventing the possible unauthorized reading of the tag.

Claims 27-28, 35-36, 38-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106 in view of Carrender et al. US Patent 5850187.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 27-28, 38-44, Hughes teaches a tag reader comprising:

a storing unit in which an encryption key is stored (col. 5 lines 46-47);

a decryption unit, which decrypts data received from the contact less communication tag based on encryption key related information that is selected from the encryption key related information and an information reading unit, which requests product information to the contact less communication tag attached to a product and reads the product information received from the contact less communication tag (col. 5 line 65-col. 6 line 52). Hughes is silent on teaching the tag reader is portable. Carrender et al. in an analogous art teaches a portable tag reader (abstract). Carrender also teaches a display for outputting information (col. 5 line 62-col. 6 line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hughes as disclosed by Carrender because a portable tag reader is more convenient to operate and is more adaptable to the application environment in which the tag reader is used.

Regarding claim 35, Hughes teaches a generating a one time use random number, adds the one time use random number to information to be transmitted to the tag reader, provides the number to the encryption unit, and check if a random number extracted from information received from the tag reader is the same as the one time use random number (col. 7 lines 16-31).

Regarding claim 36, Hughes teaches the memory is non-volatile because the tag transmit the data stored in the tag when the powering signal is received from the reader which inherently include the storing of the data in the tag memory in the absent of the powering signal (col. 1 lines 28-37) and teaches a processing unit that reads the product information from the memory (col. 5 lines 51-64).

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106 in view of Carrender et al. US Patent 5850187 and further in view of Mays et al. US Patent 6838989.

Regarding claim 37, Hughes in view of Carrender is silent on teaching the decryption unit; the storing unit is implemented in a ASIC. Mays et al. in an analogous art teaches implementing the functional circuits of RF tag reader in a ASIC (col. 6 lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hughes in view of Carrender as disclosed by Mays et al. because the ASIC provides a more economic means of packaging the function circuit into a single package.

Claims 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106 in view of Brown et al. US Patent 6909356.

Regarding claims 58-60, Hughes teaches a contact less communication tag comprising: contact less communication unit which wirelessly exchanges data with a tag reader (col. 5 lines 1-7), creates a power source from a power signal received from the tag reader (col. 2 lines 15-22);

A storing unit in which the product information an encryption key related information are stored (col. 2 lines 33-47, fig. 2);

An encryption unit, which encrypts the product information to be transmitted to the tag reader based on the encryption key related information (col. 6 lines 7-34). Hughes teaches the encryption unit provides the product information to the tag reader after encrypting the product information using the selected encryption key (col. 2 lines 33-47). Hughes is silent on teaching

Art Unit: 2612

visible information corresponding to the product information. Brown et al. teaches using a barcode in addition to a RF tag to provide product information (col. 7 lines 21-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hughes as disclosed by Brown because the RF tag and the barcode label provides multiple modes of identification and provides for a more adaptable system for ensuring the tracking of the object.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. US Patent 6842106 in view of Brown et al. US Patent 6909356 and further in view of Stewart et al. US Patent 6933848.

. Regarding claim 61, Hughes is silent on teaching the tag is destroyed so as not to be accessed by the tag reader when the product is unsealed. Stewart et al. in an analogous art teaches destroying the tag so as to prevent the tag from been read by the tag reader (col. 3 lines 23-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hughes et al. in view of Brown as disclosed by Stewart et al. destroying the tag increases the security of the RFID tag by preventing the possible unauthorized reading of the tag.

***Allowable Subject Matter***



Art Unit: 2612

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 30-34, 47-52, 54-55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 2, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest the encryption unit provides the encryption key index information corresponding to the encryption key in response to an encryption key specifying request message received from the tag reader.

Regarding claims 3-5, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest the encryption unit provides the seed value index information corresponding to the seed in response to an encryption key specifying request message received from the tag reader.

Regarding claims 7-9, 30-34, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest the encryption key related information includes a plurality of seed values for creation of an encryption key and seed value index information indicating storing locations of the plurality of seed values in a storing means included in the tag reader; and the encryption unit provides seed value index information corresponding to a seed value selected from the plurality of seed values in response to an encryption key specifying request message received from the tag reader.

Regarding claim 10, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest leaked encryption key updating unit, which transmit update request information that requests discarding of an encryption key leaked through the contact less communication unit and updating into a newly assigned encryption key to the tag reader.

Regarding claim 29, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest a leaked encryption key updating unit that upon receipt of encryption key update request information

Art Unit: 2612

concerning a leaked encryption key from the contact less communication tag, discards an encryption key designated by the encryption key update request information from the storing unit and updates with a newly assigned encryption key.

Regarding claim 47, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggests receiving encryption key update request information concerning a leaked encryption key from the contact less communication tag; and removing an encryption key designated by the encryption key update request information from the storing means and updating with a newly assigned encryption key.

Regarding claim 48, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggests the encryption key related information includes a plurality of encryption keys that is classified and assigned according to a classification reference including at least one of a type of industry, a manufacturer, a brand, and a product name; and the decryption unit decrypts the product information received from the contact less communication tag using an encryption key selected from the plurality of encryption keys based on the encryption key specifying information received from the contact less communication tag.

Regarding claim 49, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggests the encryption key related information includes at least one seed value for creation of different encryption keys; and reading of the product information includes decrypting the product information received from the contact less communication tag using an encryption key using a seed value selected based on the encryption key specifying information received from the contact less communication tag.

Claims 16-26 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 16-26, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggests rejecting provision of the product information if the number of times the product information is read exceeds a reference value.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERNAL U. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vernal U Brown/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612

Application/Control Number: 10/551,345

Page 11

Art Unit: 2612